

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 remain present in this application.

The specification and claims 1-6 have been amended, and claim 7 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1-6 have been amended for clarity and to correct the grammatical deficiencies noted by the Examiner. Without conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's restriction requirement, but simply to expedite prosecution of this application, it is noted that non-elected claim 7 has been cancelled.

Rejection under 35 USC 112

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended the claim to now refer to a line enable without specifying whether it is odd or even. Line 18 has now been amended to only refer to the line enable so that the alternative is not present. Also, the parenthesis has been removed.

In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the instant invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection are respectfully requested.

Objection to the Claims

The Examiner objected to claim 1 due to certain informalities in lines 12, 13, 15 and 17 and also suggested changes in lines 3, 4 and 18. By way of the present Amendment, Applicants have amended claim 1 to overcome these objections. Additional changes have also been made to make the claim more readable and more accurate. First, Applicants have removed the period and made the claim into a single sentence. Applicants have also removed the recitation of the data line, scan line and common line to make it clear that these are all shared by the abutting sub-pixels rather than being part of an individual sub-pixel. The recitation of the line enable has removed the indication of odd and even so that it correctly is considered to be part of each driving apparatus. Applicants have corrected lines 12, 13, 15, and 17 as indicated by the Examiner. Applicants have also corrected in a similar fashion lines 14, 16, 19, 20, 21 and 23. Applicants submit that claim 1 is more accurate in view of these changes.

Rejections under 35 USC 103

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Azumi, U.S. Publication 2001/0017618, in view of Okuda, U.S. Patent 6,650,060. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, Applicants disagree that it would be obvious to combine the teachings of Azumi and Okuda. While both references deal with a display device, there are complete differences in the manner in which the two system operate. Applicants submit that there is no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to see how these two references could be combined or have any

concept has to why they should be combined other than in retrospect after viewing the present application. Further, the Examiner has suggested that the circuit shown in Fig. 4 of Okuda could be substituted into the device of Azami with the node connected to the gates of transistors 45 and 46 of Okuda being connected to the drain of the control element of the Azami. Applicants disagree that it would be obvious to bodily take one of the embodiments of Okuda and connect it in this manner to Azami without some reason for having a desire to do so.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that the Azami reference is designed for a different purpose than that of the present invention. Azami relates to a source driver while the present application is a circuit to be used in a pixel in the display. Applicants submit that the Examiner is incorrect in comparing Vref1 and Vref2 of the reference with the odd and even line enables in the present application or to compare SS1 and SS2 with the scan line of the present application. Applicants submit that the purposes of these various signals are different and that the correlation of these signals are improper. Further, the Examiner has compared the data line and supply line of the present application with the current supply and source line in Fig. 36A of the Azami. Applicants submit that these lines are also not comparable. The data line of the present application is closer in purpose to the source line of Azami and the supply line of the present application is more similar to the current supply. Further, Azami includes a shared Vdd line, whereas the present device shares a data line. Thus, the arrangements of the various input lines and purposes of the various parts in Azami are different than those of the present application.

Further, the Examiner has referred to Fig. 10 to teach a control element. While Applicants concede that the use of a transistor in place of a mechanical switch would be obvious, Applicants disagree with the Examiner's understanding of the manner in which the transistor

would be connected. Applicants submit that the source of the transistors are not being connected to odd and even line enables, but rather merely connected to a D/A converter circuit. Further, as noted above, the Vref1 and Vref2 signals are not equivalent to the line enable signals of the present invention. Applicants submit that the use of transistors for the mechanical switches shown in Fig. 10 of Azami would not be obvious.

The Examiner has further admitted that Azami does not teach a common connection and does not teach the four elements having the various connections as recited in the claim. Applicants submit that these four elements and their connections go to the heart of the present invention. It is clear that without these elements and connections, Azami cannot teach the present invention.

The Examiner has relied on Okuda to show three of the elements. However, even if Okuda and Azami are combined, there is no teaching of a circuit for a pixel having this arrangement of four transistors and a capacitor with their appropriate connections to various input lines and a light emission element. The Examiner has tried to compensate for Okuda's lack of a fourth element by including a switch from Azami which is not a transistor and which is not connected to the input lines in the same manner. Applicants submit that the Examiner is trying to cobble together all of the elements of the claim by piecemeal selection of parts from two different references which are for different purposes and which would not operate in the same manner. Further, Applicants submit that trying to add the three transistor circuit of Okuda to the Azami reference by adding a fourth element from that reference would not be obvious except in hindsight. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 1 would not be obvious over this combination of references.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art utilized by the Examiner fails to teach or suggest the current driving apparatus of independent claim 1 and its dependent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC 103 rejection are respectfully requested.

Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 16, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Joe McKinney Muncy
Registration No.: 34,334

ROBERT FAUSE
212-91

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorneys for Applicant